

REMARKS

Claims 8, 9 and 15-32 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 8, 9, 15 and 16 are amended; claims 10-14 are canceled; and claims 21-32 are added.

No new matter is added by this Amendment. Support for the amendments to claims 8, 9, 15 and 16, as well as the new claims, is found in the original specification and figures. In particular, support for the language added to claims 8 and 9, as well as new claims 21 and 30 may be found in the specification at paragraphs 68-69, as well as at, for example, Figs. 2A-3D. Support for new claims 22-29 and 31-32 may be found in claims 10-14 and 15-20.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representative by Examiner Trinh in the August 9, 2005 personal interview. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. Form PTO-892

The Patent Office applies U.S. Patent No. 5,514,879 (Yamazaki) in a rejection to be further discussed below. However, Yamazaki is not listed as a reference on the Form PTO-892 that was attached to the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicant requests the Patent Office to either revise the Form PTO-892 that was included with the last Office Action, or issue a new Form PTO-892 including Yamazaki, to ensure that Yamazaki will be included as a cited reference on the face of the Letters Patent once the application issues.

II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 8-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. In particular, the Office Action asserts that "a source region 17" is defined as a first region, "a drain region 18" is defined as a second region, and "diffused region 23" is defined as a third region in the specification at paragraphs [0063]-[0064]. The Office Action

further asserts that in claim 8, the first region appears to be the diffused region 23, the second region appears to be the source region, and the third region appears to be the drain region.

Claims 10-14 are canceled, and as such, the rejection of these claims is moot.

However, with respect to claims 8, 9 and 15-20, Applicant herein amends claims 8, 15 and 16, where needed, to ensure that the first, second and third regions in the claims correspond to the first, second and third regions in the specification. There was no need to amend claims 9 and 17-20 as these claims do not recite a first, a second or a third region.

Applicant submits the requirements of the Patent Office have been met, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 8, 14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 4,463,492 (Maeguchi) and claims 8, 14-17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,514,879 (Yamazaki). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 recites a method of manufacturing a transistor including forming a plurality of third regions in a semiconductor film by a first ion doping of a first impurity of a second conduction type, each of the plurality of third regions being separated by a space; and forming a first region and a second region in the semiconductor film by a second ion doping of a second impurity of a first conduction type, a gate electrode overlapping at least a part of each of the plurality of third regions, and the plurality of third regions located between the first region and the second region.

Claim 21 recites a method of manufacturing a transistor including forming a third region in a semiconductor film by a first ion doping of a first impurity of a second conduction type, and forming a first region and a second region in the semiconductor film by a second ion doping of a second impurity of a first conduction type, a dosage of the second impurity

being smaller than a dosage of the first impurity, the third region including a first part, a second part, and a channel region disposed between the first part and the second part, the first part being located between the first region and the channel region, and the second part being located between the second region and the channel region.

Neither Maeguchi nor Yamazaki discloses the features of claims 8 and 21. More specifically, as acknowledged by the Examiner during the August 9, 2005 personal interview nowhere does Maeguchi and/or Yamazaki disclose forming a plurality of third regions in the semiconductor film by a first ion doping of a first impurity of a second conduction type, each of the plurality of third regions being separated by a space, as recited in claim 8.

Furthermore, nowhere does Maeguchi and/or Yamazaki disclose forming a third region by a first ion doping of a first impurity of a second conduction type and forming a first region and a second region by a second ion doping of a second impurity of a first conduction type, as recited in claims 8 and 21.

Accordingly, claims 8 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not anticipated by Maeguchi and/or Yamazaki. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

IV. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Maeguchi taken with U.S. Patent No. 5,016,986 (Kawashima); claims 8-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,605,855 (Chang) taken with U.S. Patent No. 4,232,327 (Hsu).

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 10-14 are herein canceled. As such, with respect to these claims, this rejection is moot.

With respect to claim 8 and new claim 21, the applied references of record, in any combination, fail to render obvious these claims or the claims dependent therefrom. That is,

neither Kawashima, Chang nor Hsu, in any combination, cure the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Maeguchi and Yamazaki. Specifically, none of the applied references teach or suggest forming a third region by a first ion doping of a first impurity of a second conduction type, and forming a first and a second region by a second ion doping of a second impurity of a first conduction type. Furthermore, none of the applied references teach or suggest a third region separated into a first part and a second part by a channel region, the first part being located between the first region and the channel region, and the second part being located between the second region and the channel region.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 8 and 21, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are not rendered obvious by Maeguchi, Kawashima, Chang and Hsu, in any combination. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is thus respectfully requested.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of pending claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:LMS/mdw

Date: August 15, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461